

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are pending in this application, of which claim 1 is independent. Claim 5 has been amended to correct a typographical error. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

The specification and drawings have been amended to overcome the objections raised by the examiner. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hansen (U.S. 3,461,422).

Claim 1 recites a safety system for an elevator fitted with an elevator control unit (5), and at each elevator landing door (21), electrical contacts (11, 12) that indicate the locking state and the closing state of the elevator landing door. The safety system of claim 1 includes “- elevator landing door surveillance units (10), installed on each elevator landing door, to receive the state of the electrical contacts (11, 12) fitted to each of the elevator landing doors (21), - synthesis unit (4) connected to the surveillance units (10) to receive the state of the elevator landing door electrical contacts (11, 12), and to the elevator control unit (5) to receive other information on the working order of the elevator, - alarm signal devices (13, 14), - synthesis unit (4) further comprising means of determining (41) the state in which the elevator landing doors are in according to the received information, and to actuate the signal devices (13, 14) if the state of the elevator landing doors is considered to be critical to the elevator users.”

Hansen does not disclose or suggest these features of claim 1. For example, Hansen does not teach or suggest the claimed “elevator landing door surveillance unit,” that is, a component that indicates both the locking state and the closing state of the elevator landing door with which the surveillance unit is installed. At most, Hansen discloses an alarm system that, as the examiner correctly notes, contains switches which determine the opened or closed state of a hoistway door. The switches of Hansen do not detect the locked or unlocked state of a hoistway door. For at least this reason, claim 1 is patentable over Hansen.

As an additional distinction, the safety system of claim 1 includes a “synthesis unit” to determine the state of the elevator landing doors according to information received from the

surveillance units and the elevator control unit with which the synthesis unit is connected. The switches of Hansen are connected to trigger an alarm whenever a hoistway door is opened to the elevator shaft without the elevator being parked at the door. The alarm system of Hansen does not include the claimed "synthesis unit" that identifies the specific state of each elevator landing door. In other words, the alarm system of Hansen can only detect that one of the hoistway doors is opened but does not know which hoistway door in particular triggered the alarm.

Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7 depend on claim 1 and are patentable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 8-11 depend on claim 1, and were rejected as obvious over Hansen in view of Coste et al. (U.S. 4,750,591). The latter reference adds no teachings or suggestion to Hansen to render claim 1 obvious and therefore claims 8-11 are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 from which they depend.

The applicant acknowledges the examiner's indication that claim 4 contains allowable subject matter.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.


Enclosed is a \$60.00 check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Applicant : Jean-Patrick Azpitarte
Serial No. : 10/620,649
Filed : July 16, 2003
Page : 10 of 10

Attorney's Docket No.: 18524-002001
Client's Ref. No. VIG.ML.60777US

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11/18/05



Mandy Jubang
Reg. No. 45,884

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

21145993.doc

Applicant : Jean-Patrick Azpitarte
Serial No. : 10/620,649
Filed : July 16, 2003
Page : 7 of 10

Attorney's Docket No.: 18524-002001
Client's Ref. No. VIG.ML.60777US

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

The attached replacement sheets of drawings includes changes to Figs. 1, 2, and 4 and replaces the original sheets including Figs. 1, 2, 3, and 4.

Attachments following last page of this Amendment:

Replacement Sheets (2 pages)

Annotated Sheet Showing Change(s) (2 pages)



Equipment Room




Fig. 1




Fig. 2

Alarm Signal Device at Caretaker's Premises




Fig. 3




Fig. 4